

MDR Tracking Number: M5-04-1311-01

Under the provisions of Section 413.031 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A of the Texas Labor Code, effective June 17, 2001 and Commission Rule 133.305 titled Medical Dispute Resolution - General and 133.308 titled Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent Review Organizations, the Medical Review Division assigned an IRO to conduct a review of the disputed medical necessity issues between the requestor and the respondent. The dispute was received on 1-9-04.

The Medical Review Division has reviewed the IRO decision and determined that **the requestor prevailed** on the issues of medical necessity. Therefore, upon receipt of this Order and in accordance with §133.308(r)(9), the Commission hereby orders the respondent and non-prevailing party to **refund the requestor \$650** for the paid IRO fee. For the purposes of determining compliance with the order, the Commission will add 20 days to the date the order was deemed received as outlined on page one of this order.

In accordance with §413.031(e), it is a defense for the carrier if the carrier timely complies with the IRO decision.

Based on review of the disputed issues within the request, the Medical Review Division has determined that **medical necessity was the only issue** to be resolved. The fluoroscope examination was found to be medically necessary. The respondent raised no other reasons for denying reimbursement for the above listed service.

On this basis, and pursuant to §§402.042, 413.016, 413.031, and 413.019 of the Act, the Medical Review Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to pay the unpaid medical fees in accordance with the fair and reasonable rate as set forth in Commission Rule 133.1(a)(8) plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the requestor within 20 days of receipt of this order. This Order is applicable to dates of service through in this dispute.

The respondent is prohibited from asserting additional denial reasons relative to this Decision upon issuing payment to the requestor in accordance with this Order (Rule 133.307(j)(2)).

This Decision and Order is hereby issued this 9th day of March 2004.

Regina L. Cleave
Medical Dispute Resolution Officer
Medical Review Division
RLC/rlc

March 5, 2004

Rosalinda Lopez
Texas Workers' Compensation Commission
Medical Dispute Resolution
Fax: (512) 804-4868

Re: MDR #: M5-04-1311-01
IRO Certificate No.: IRO 5055

___ has performed an independent review of the medical records of the above-named case to determine medical necessity. In performing this review, ___ reviewed relevant medical records, any documents provided by the parties referenced above, and any documentation and written information submitted in support of the dispute.

I am the Secretary and General Counsel of ___ and I certify that the reviewing healthcare professional in this case has certified to our organization that there are no known conflicts of interest that exist between him and any of the treating physicians or other health care providers or any of the physicians or other health care providers who reviewed this case for determination prior to referral to the Independent Review Organization.

The independent review was performed by a matched peer with the treating health care provider. This case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Chronic Pain Management.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Information Provided for Review:

Correspondence
Procedure report

Clinical History:

This male claimant suffered a work-related injury on _____. Bilateral lumbar medial branch blocks were performed using fluoroscopy on 04/03/03.

Disputed Services:

Fluoroscope exam on 04/03/03.

Decision:

The reviewer disagrees with the determination of the insurance carrier and is of the opinion that the procedure in dispute as stated was medically necessary in this case.

Rationale:

A valid spine generator workup demands precise needle placement and medication deposition. It is impossible to accomplish and verify the requirements without fluoroscopic use. Performing such a procedure "blind" would certainly waste valuable time, resources, and the acquisition of useless and likely misleading information.